

Serial No.: 09/867,064

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/468001/P10673

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 12-15 were pending in the application prior to the present amendment. Please add new claims 16-26. New claims 16-26 are supported in the specification; therefore, no new matter is added.

The specification stands objected to. The title stands objected to. The numbering of the claims is objected to. Claim 14 is objected to for improper grammar. Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for improper antecedent basis. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,193,167 to Sites ("Sites"). Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sites in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,597 to Panwar ("Panwar").

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the objections have been overcome and rejections are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. The Objection to the Specification

The specification has been amended as suggested.

II. The Objection to the Title

The title has been amended to more clearly reflect the pending claims.

Serial No.: 09/867,064

Attorney's Docket No.:10559/468001/P10673

III. The Objection to the Claim Numbering

Claims 12-15 have been cancelled. New claims 16-19 have been added. New claims 16-19 are similar to cancelled claims 12-15.

IV. The Objection to claim 14

New claim 18, which corresponds to original claim 14 is grammatically correct.

V. The Prior Art RejectionsClaim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to further emphasize patentable aspects of the current disclosure. Particularly, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the self-destruct register is "configured to automatically clear upon reading." This feature is neither taught or suggested in Sites.

The office action alleges that column 15, lines 15-30 teaches this feature of claim 1. However, the cited portion of Sites merely teaches that the lock flag 96 is set to zero, or cleared. (Please see column 15, lines 14 and 20 of Sites).

That is, Sites does not teach or suggest that lock flag 96 is automatically cleared upon reading, as recited in claim 1. In fact, the language "set to zero" implies that action is taken to clear the flag (to set it to zero).

Typically, a flag is cleared in response to receiving a clear flag signal. The language in Sites does not teach that

Serial No.: 09/067,064

Attorney's Docket No.:10589/468001/P10673

lock flag 96 is configured differently than a typical flag. Lock flag 96 is clearly configured so that it may be cleared by external action other than a read of its contents. For example, Sites teaches that "The lock flag 96 of a CPU 10 is also cleared if the CPU encounters any exception, interrupt, or a call PALcode instruction." (Please see column 15, lines 28-30 of Sites).

At least because Sites neither teaches nor suggests this feature of claim 1, claim 1 is patentable over Sites.

Claims 7-10 and 16-26

Independent claims 7 and 17 include features similar to those discussed above, and are therefore patentable for at least similar reasons. Claims 8-10, 16, and 18-26 depend from the above independent claims, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

New claims 20-26

Additionally, new claims 20-26 are patentable over Sites for at least the additional reason that there is no teaching or suggestion in Sites that lock flag 96 comprise a plurality of bits. Instead, Sites teaches that the status of lock flag 96 is either "set" or "cleared."

For at least this additional reason, new claims 20-26 are patentable over Sites.

Serial No.: 09/867,064

Attorney's Docket No.:10559/468001/P10673

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue, or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Claims 1-10 and 16-26 are in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (858) 678-4311.

Serial No.: 09/867,064

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/468001/P10673

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account
No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Linda G. Gunderson
Reg. No. 46,341
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Date: 03/14/2005
Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10470506.doc